



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

decisive services rendered to the cause of International Arbitration by the United States, and particularly by President Roosevelt. Better than any one, I know that the Court at The Hague stood deserted, abandoned and ridiculed until the day when he had the courage, generosity and foresight to save it. That act alone has entitled him to the thanks of all Europe for his pacific and liberal spirit."

We gladly share the glory of having been the first among the nations to throw open the doors of the Tribunal with our sister republic, the Republic of Mexico, who spontaneously united with us in referring the Pious Fund case to the Court, and (we are happy to share that glory as well) with all the powers, great and small, who were parties to the Venezuela controversy.

While the Hague Conference was not able, because the time was not yet ripe, to limit the progressive increase of armaments and the economic burdens that that ascending scale of war preparations entail upon the nations in time of peace, we need not be without hope that there is much truth in the thesis developed by Jean de Bloch in his great book, "The Future of War," that the immense drain of the increasing cost of war and of armaments will necessarily from purely economic reasons compel retrenchment and limitation.

It was my privilege during the past summer to deliver an address before our Naval War College at Newport. My audience was composed entirely of distinguished naval officers and admirals, captains, commanders and lieutenants in our navy. My subject, which was left to their choice, was the "Scope and Meaning of the Hague Tribunal," and I am gratified to bear my testimony here that among no class of our people could be found a set of men who have a deeper and more sympathetic interest in furthering the cause of peace. I am informed that the same is true especially in regard to the naval men of other nations, and that we can count upon them as our most effective allies.

The very fact that behind the world's diplomacy stands ever open the doors of the Hague Tribunal, whose permanent mission, the peaceful adjustment of international differences, cannot fail to have an ever-increasing voice in the chancelleries of nations and on the deck of every warship of every civilized power.

Time does not permit me to dwell upon the scope and meaning of the Hague Treaty, upon its three plans and methods to lessen the causes of war, respectively, a Commission of Inquiry, Mediation and Arbitration. I entirely agree with the late Frederick W. Holls, the distinguished Secretary of the American Commission, the historian of the Peace Conference, whose untimely death we so deeply deplore, in his estimate of the treaty as "The Magna Charta of International Law." It is more than that, it is an International Covenant on the Mount.

The treaty has been criticised as lacking obligatory power; technically speaking that is true, and it is also true that its compelling force rests upon the highest and most binding considerations among nations, upon international honor and the moral grandeur of the signatory powers. It will require time and experience to develop its true and full scope and meaning, just as it required time and experience to develop the full scope and meaning of the Constitution of these United States. The significance of the treaty as an effective instrument of peace will largely depend upon the construction and

method of application of Article 27 defining the duties of the signatory powers. That section provides:

"The signatory powers consider it their duty, in case a serious dispute threatens to break out between two or more of them, to remind these latter that the Permanent Court of Arbitration is open to them. Consequently they declare that the fact of reminding the parties in controversy of the provisions of the present convention, and the advice given to them in the higher interest of peace to have recourse to the Permanent Court, can only be considered as an exercise of good offices."

How and in what manner the initiative provided for by this article is to be exercised is of the highest importance, which time and circumstances will and must develop. The subject did not escape the wise forethought of the Conference, but it was determined by the majority to leave the provisions in its present form, doubtless having in mind that time, circumstances and experience would develop the most effective form of initiative. This Congress and future congresses could not in my judgment address themselves to a more practical and imperative subject than in ascertaining and developing the most acceptable and effective method and plan as to how and by whom this initiative is to be invoked and applied. I will not forestall such a consideration of the subject by venturing any suggestions or opinion, but will content myself with emphasizing with all earnestness the extreme importance of the subject.

I cannot speak with authority, or with even an intimate knowledge of facts, but I may be permitted to express the feeling of disappointment which was shared by many that, largely growing out of the failure of an international understanding to invoke the initiative as contemplated by the section quoted, the full force and moral effect of the treaty could not be or was not applied in a supreme effort to avert the appalling war now raging with such lurid and destructive heroism between Russia and Japan. Under the treaty the right to offer good offices or mediation appertains to the powers even during the course of hostilities, and it is provided that the exercise of this right shall never be regarded as an unfriendly act.

May the voice of this Congress awaken the nations to the exercise of their moral obligations, and may the Hague Treaty be sent upon its mediating mission of peace by the aroused public sentiment of the world as the practical fruit of the deliberations of this Thirteenth International Peace Congress.

---

## Proceedings of the Thirteenth International Peace Congress.

The opening meeting of the Thirteenth International Peace Congress, for the welcome of the delegates, was held in Tremont Temple, Boston, at 2 P. M., October 3. Every seat in the great auditorium was taken, and more than three thousand people had to be turned away. The platform was filled with prominent people from Boston and vicinity, who came to join in the welcome.

The meeting was opened by Edwin D. Mead, Chairman of the Committee on Organization. He said that the highest victory of power is self-restraint; that the result of the Congress would be most beneficent, if it

taught them all that mutual knowledge which modifies prejudices and restrains bitterness of thought and expression. Mr. Mead then introduced Hon. John Hay, Secretary of State, to extend the welcome of the national government to the delegates, after quoting the statement made by Mr. Hay at the Congress of the International Press Association at St. Louis, to the effect that the press had the power, if it would use it, to put an end to war forever.

Mr. Hay was received with long-continued applause, the entire audience rising, and his address of welcome on behalf of the government made a deep impression. We give it in full elsewhere in this issue.

The governor of Massachusetts, Hon. John L. Bates, who was to have extended the welcome for the State, being kept away by the funeral of Senator Hoar, he was represented by Hon. George R. Jones, president of the Massachusetts Senate.

Senator Jones, after paying a high tribute to Senator Hoar as a lifelong friend of peace, who "abhorred war and all its attendant woe and evil," said he knew of no better place for a peace congress than the soil of Massachusetts. The history of the State had been a gradual unfolding of high and enlightened ideals, and the men who had made Massachusetts great had been representative of those ideals. As representing the people of "the grand old Commonwealth of Massachusetts," he, in their name, bade the delegates a most cordial welcome, and expressed the wish that the deliberations of the Congress might be such that the influence of its action would be world-wide and lasting.

Hon. Patrick A. Collins, mayor of Boston, in extending a welcome to the delegates on behalf of the city, said that he counted it one of the choice honors of his magistracy to be associated with the great gathering before him and the great movement for peace. It needed no official word of his to give the welcome of Boston, the cradle of the peace movement, the place of its nurture. He declared the delegates welcome to the hearts and homes of the city, and desired that their coming together might be profitable for the advancement of the cause "which he also had in his inmost heart."

Responses to these addresses of welcome were made on behalf of the delegates by the Bishop of Hereford, from England, and Hon. John Lund, ex-president of the Norwegian Parliament.

The Bishop said that it was impossible for him to find words to express fittingly the common feeling of gratitude for the reception accorded them. They came from various quarters of the world. The Church of England, which he could not claim to represent, had not a member who would not feel grateful for the reception, if he ever heard of it. They came not only from Europe; there were present three distinguished representatives from the desolated region of Armenia. No persons could appeal more strongly than these that everything possible might be done for peace, so marred in that region.

He was especially grateful for the words in which the welcome had been expressed by Secretary Hay. Mr. Hay's presence gave a new character to the peace gatherings. The address was all the more valuable because delivered by the Secretary in person. Mr. Hay was

well known and greatly respected and honored in Europe, and his words, which would be read all over the world, would have great weight with the European cabinets and chancelleries.

Those who had been laboring in the cause of peace had not always been considered very influential persons. He felt sometimes that some of his own friends sometimes said that "this excellent Bishop was of the nature of a crank." But every one who gave himself up to battle for great unpopular principles was liable to such criticism.

As to the peace movement, they had come to a time of change. They had to thank the Czar of Russia — and he himself did it with a grateful heart — for bringing the subject of peace, arbitration and disarmament into the region of practical politics. The coming of the Secretary of State of the great Republic to the Congress was, furthermore, an earnest that these principles were to have, in the time to come, practical application such as never before. The Bishop thought that nothing need be said on the general principles for which they were working. All that was needed was that the members of the Congress should say ditto to Mr. Hay's speech. There was one word, however, that Mr. Hay could not say; namely, that they who were striving for arbitration, peace and disarmament among the nations were looking to the United States to take the lead in the matter. Their hope was fixed on the future international policy of the United States, which now had one of the greatest opportunities of history. No other country had such power to help forward this great movement. They all must have noted the fundamental difference between Mr. Hay's noble words and the ordinary, should he say, hypocrisies of diplomacy. The great nations of Europe, as he followed them, seemed to believe in an entirely wrong theory of life. Their theory seemed to be what might be called the menagerie theory. Mr. Hay's theory was that human society was a brotherhood, a family. All men everywhere must be inspired with this idea. Certain wrong notions of dominance, religious dominance and dynastic dominance, which had desolated the earth, must be swept away. The idea of national dominance must go, too. The rule of the future must be national and international coöperation.

Hon. John Lund, who had just come from attending the Interparliamentary Conference at St. Louis, said he well knew that the honor of being called upon to say a few words was given him because he represented the Nobel Committee of the Norwegian Parliament. The enemy they were fighting — war — was older than history. In our time the art of killing men had reached its greatest perfection. Though Europe had been in peace for a generation, the "armed peace" had increased military expenditures to an unreasonable extent.

But greater than the material losses was the demoralization brought about by war. The idleness and dissipation of a military life coarsened and stupified men, and our age and civilization were disgraced in consequence. The grand parades in time of peace, the electrifying music of the bands, made people forget the shady side of war, the slaughter, the mutilation, the boundless sorrow, the economic misery, the moral ruin. War, instead of bringing blessings, really only brings stagnation and retrogression. There was ample opportunity in time of

peace for the display of the heroic characteristics exhibited in war.

The organized army of peace had but a brief history, though peace and goodwill had been preached since the days of the Prince of Peace. Even to the end of the eighteenth century it was believed by scarcely any one that war could within any measurable future be appreciably reduced. It was reserved for the nineteenth century to take the first serious steps toward the abolition of war and the substitution for it of judicial methods of settling disputes. The United States, he was glad to say, had from the beginning, from the days of Channing and Burritt, taken a prominent place in the movement. Within the last fifteen years, through the Interparliamentary Union and the Peace Congress, the cause had made good progress. These organizations were at first laughed at, but all that had passed away, and five years ago the first International Peace Congress of the governments had been held at The Hague. As a member of the Interparliamentary Union he had recently had the great joy of hearing President Roosevelt declare at the White House that he would, on the suggestion of the Union, call in the near future a second International Governmental Peace Conference.

The cause of peace was now on the programs of the people, the governments and the parliaments. A fourth power, the press, was still to be won. Even this had at St. Louis at the Press Congress placed peace on its program. He felt sure that the press of this country would hereafter prove a loyal and steady ally of the cause. And first of all, in the ranks of the peace army they had one of the strongest powers in the world — that of women. A new day was dawning. It was only a question of a few years and the peace army would bring home the victory.

The first day's program closed with a largely attended reception to the delegates by the Twentieth Century Club at 2 Ashburton Place.

#### SECOND DAY'S PROCEEDINGS.

The first business session of the Congress was held on Tuesday, October 4, at 10 A. M., in the Auditorium of Tremont Temple. The meeting was called to order by Edwin D. Mead, Chairman of the Committee on Organization.

In welcoming the delegates Mr. Mead recalled the fact that it was in the old Tremont Theatre (now Tremont Temple) that Elihu Burritt gave his first peace address in 1841, and Charles Sumner his great oration on "The True Grandeur of Nations" in 1845. In Tremont Temple also in 1899 the principal American meetings to promote interest in the Hague Conference were held. The last half century, he said, had strongly emphasized Burritt's plea for human brotherhood and Sumner's arraignment of the wicked waste on armaments. Our own Republic, from which better things were to be expected, had lately yielded to the temptation to make herself a great naval power and follow the old ambition to secure respect by force. He hoped that the presence and criticism of so many from the burdened nations of Europe would "call them back to their great national ideas and their better selves." They must remember that conditions were now becoming everywhere alike; that no nation could keep much ahead of others;

the Europeans could help America best by checking their own armaments. In spite of its faults, the United States was doing great service for peace. The President, as Mr. d'Estournelles de Constant had declared, had made the Hague Court a reality. He was taking steps to call a second Hague Conference, to push the work left undone by the first. The American people were waking up. They would soon declare that all playing with the fire of militarism in this Republic must cease. War, they were told, would cease when the millennium came. He pitied those who had such poor notions of the millennium. War befitted only the early and low stages of civilization. Horrors and wickedness like those now going on in Asia ought not even to be mentioned among civilized men. The time had passed for putting up signs warning civilized men not to steal or kill. The Beatitudes should be put upon the walls of churches. Only thus could a fair start for the millennium be made. This year was the centennial of the presidency of Jefferson, of the death of the author of "Eternal Peace," of the birth of Richard Cobden. The succession of apostles of peace was never broken. They were multiplying to-day as never before. The vision and devotion of Kant, Cobden, Victor Hugo and Sumner would be to-morrow those of every thoughtful German, Frenchman, Englishman and American.

Mr. Mead then nominated for president of the Congress Hon. Robert Treat Paine, president of the American Peace Society, and for secretary, Benjamin F. Trueblood. The nominations were unanimously and enthusiastically approved. On taking the chair, Mr. Paine thanked the Congress for the honor bestowed upon him. He rejoiced to see such large numbers present. The delegates had heretofore met in Paris, London, Rome, Hamburg, and other cities. He now welcomed them to the old Puritan town of Boston. He hoped they would visit our historic places, State Street, the Old South Church, Bunker Hill, where blood was shed, and then come back to the Temple of Peace to do what they could to make such things hereafter impossible. He welcomed them heartily, pledging for Boston all that was possible to make their stay enjoyable.

The cause they were working in, he said, was the greatest cause before the world to-day. Its progress depended upon the faithfulness with which they uttered their belief in its rightness and practicability. The cause was making more progress than any other great cause before the world. They were all saddened, of course, by the deeds of the awful war on the other side of the globe. But the earthquake and the tornado did not last forever. At no distant day the whole world would be again at peace.

The rivalry of nations, once so baneful, was now being directed into nobler channels. The nations were beginning to vie with one another in mutual helpfulness. The friends of peace could point the skeptics with pride to the progress of the peace cause, which had been greater in the last thirteen years than that of any other cause of equal importance. Victory was not far away; they were going on conquering and to conquer. A wonderful movement was now going on in western Europe. Treaties of obligatory arbitration were being rapidly signed. He regretted that the United States had missed her opportunity to lead in this treaty move-

ment. But Secretary Hay, whom Americans believed to be the greatest living statesman, had come to this Congress and arrayed the government on the side of peace and arbitration. It was hoped that, instead of a treaty with Great Britain alone, the United States would soon have treaties with all civilized countries stipulating the settlement of their disputes by arbitration.

One other great achievement he hoped for — the early establishment of a congress of the nations to meet at stated periods, not clothed at first with power to legislate, but to advise and recommend.

#### RESPONSES FROM THE DIFFERENT NATIONS.

Representatives of the different nations from whom delegates had come to the Congress then responded.

Mr. Houzeau de Lehaie, member of the Belgian Senate and of the Interparliamentary Union, who had served as President of the Antwerp Peace Congress in 1894, said, in French, that he was proud to be the first of the foreigners to speak. He had been to St. Louis, and was greatly impressed with both the immensity of the country and the progress it had made in so short a time. His own country, one of the smallest, had been the cockpit and fighting ground of Europe, annexed at different times to he did not know how many states. Now after three-quarters of a century of peace his country felt all the keener a desire that war might be abolished and arbitration adopted, so that she might never again be the battleground of the great powers. Those who knew war were not those who made war. The war-makers sat quietly at home and sent others out to be crushed and maimed. They spent the money which they themselves did not contribute. They knew nothing of the miseries which they entailed on others. Here in America, he said, forty-five states existed in unity. How long would it be till Europe was in the same condition? The last century saw the rise of the United States of America. This century, he predicted, would see the United States of Europe, and the next the United States of the World, living in justice, amity and peace.

Response was made for France by Prof. Theodore Ruyssen, of the University of Aix, President of the *Association de la Paix par le Droit*. He was proud to speak for France. A young man, he regretted the absence of the elders of his country. He begged them to remember that Frederic Passy, the veteran French Apostle of Peace, still lived and continued his work with all the fire and enthusiasm of youth. All the young French peace advocates were Passy's intellectual children. A Frenchman, he said, felt much at home in America. Everywhere he found things that reminded him of home and of the part France had played in the building up of this country — towns, rivers, streets, with French names. The relations of France and the United States were unique; not a drop of blood had ever been spilled between them. There had been talk of war between the United States and Germany, — which God forbid, — but never of war between the United States and France. He brought good news of the peace movement in France. The war scare over the Algerian frontier had come to nothing, the jingo party being defeated by the Socialist and the peace parties combined. Two years ago the national peace congress at Toulouse had attracted barely fifty delegates; this year

six hundred delegates attended a similar meeting. Everything in America he found big — the towns, the rivers, the buildings. He hoped the peace movement would be big enough to correspond.

The President then explained why the veteran French Apostle of Peace was absent. The mention of Mr. Passy's name and services called out the most hearty applause.

Dr. Adolf Richter, president of the German Peace Society, who had presided at the Peace Congress at Hamburg in 1897, responded for Germany. He brought the greetings of the German peace workers, and their best wishes for the success of the Boston Congress. He greeted the American Peace Society and its Boston leaders, as the real originators of the peace movement throughout the world. He appreciated the great hospitality with which the foreign delegates had been received. If the peace movement was going on slowly, if there were still places where the gun and the sword ruled, they must not be discouraged. They were fighting an evil entrenched behind the centuries. War had been looked upon as a way of securing right; peace people hoped for a time when war would be looked upon as a great wrong, a sin. The German Peace Society, one of the youngest, now had, after twelve years of existence, twelve thousand members in seventy different towns and cities. It was seeking to win the coming generation by education.

Mr. Thomas Snape, Alderman of Liverpool and President of the Liverpool Peace Society, spoke for the British delegation. He began by setting forth the intimate trade relations between Boston and Liverpool, and their common interest in the preservation of peace. He had begun to work for arbitration as a substitute for war more than forty years ago. Its early advocates had great difficulty in getting a hearing. They had now passed away and the advocates of to-day, instead of being reckoned dreamers as those early ones were, were considered practical men. Kings listened to them and presidents received them. He spoke in glowing terms of President Roosevelt's recent reception of the Interparliamentary delegates, and of the promise he had made to call a new International Peace Conference. He was greatly impressed with the presence of Secretary Hay at the opening meeting of the Congress. To have the British Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs at a peace meeting would be considered a great thing in England. The next time the Peace Congress met in England, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, if not the Prime Minister himself, would be reminded of what had happened here, and urged to attend. He had heard peace utterances from both President Harrison and President Roosevelt. The greater warmth of the latter's words he attributed to the remarkable progress of the movements rather than to difference of attitude. International arbitration and disarmament had now come within the realm of practical politics. Universal peace he declared to be as sure as the triumph of civilization over barbarism.

E. T. Moneta, editor of *La Vita Internazionale* and president of the Lombard Peace Union at Milan, brought the greetings of the Italian workers. He had been a soldier of Garibaldi and knew what war was like. On the field of battle he had pledged himself to the cause of peace. He had come to the Congress because he wanted to see this country, the El Dorado of Youth,

with its fertile soil, its excellent millionaires, and its ladies who had been able to conquer the proudest aristocrats of Europe. He declared that all people, small or great, rich or poor, had their rights, and that they should be helped to obtain them. Italy, he said, now had a great peace organization. They published a periodical and an illustrated almanac. He was proud to recall that when they were few and weak in Italy, a Boston lady, Miss Cora King, had given them thirty thousand francs and thus enabled them to strengthen their society. He hoped that as the Swiss cantons, in their federation and peace, were an example to Europe, so the United States might serve as an example to the whole world.

The Abbé Pichot, vice-president of the Institute of Peace Studies at Monaco, brought the greetings of the friends of peace in the principality of Monaco. He said that he felt honored to speak in America, the fatherland of liberty, where was a government of laws, not of men, where all were equal in rights, where all races fraternized, where intelligence and labor were appreciated and rewarded.

He was impressed on arriving in New York at the manner in which the flags of all nations saluted each other. This spirit of brotherliness did not prevent friendly rivalry, but it did prevent violence. He hoped that, as a result of this Peace Congress and other influences, this state of things would soon be realized in all the world, that war between nations would be condemned as murder now is between individuals. He liked to remember Boston as the birthplace of Franklin, the application of whose discovery united men everywhere. The originators of the peace movement in Boston saw in peace something more than a means of commercial prosperity, even the spirit of love and Christian charity.

A year and a half ago the International Peace Institute was founded in Monaco. Its purpose was to publish documents and statistics concerning war and peace. They were preparing for next year an *Annuaire of International Life*. They would publish later a history of international arbitration in Switzerland, and statistics of the general cost of war in the world, so far as these could be obtained. In concluding, the Abbé said that more than a year ago, as a result of the Peace Congress held at Monaco in 1902, the garrison of Monaco had been disbanded, and thus an example of disarmament set by the principality.

Hon. John Lund, for many years president of the Norwegian parliament, was next introduced, to respond for Norway. Mr. Lund brought greetings from the Land of the Midnight Sun. The Norsemen, under Erikson, had discovered America, but they did not know enough to put the great discovery to use. But since that time they had appreciated the worth of America. Thousands of Norway's sons had come to this land. A million and a half had found homes and comfort under American free institutions. The old land was thankful for this. Norway, after obtaining a free constitution, had made steady progress. Her shipping was very great. So was her part in art, science and literature. She was trying to do her part in the general work of civilization, and especially in work for arbitration and peace. Norway had been represented in nearly all the Interparliamentary Conferences. She was

the first to make a contribution to the Bureau of the Union at Berne. The Storting has since that time voted annual contributions to both the Union Bureau and the Peace Bureau. Norway was among the first to try to secure arbitration treaties. The present Foreign Minister was much interested in the subject. They were negotiating for treaties with ten different countries, and some treaties were already being brought to successful conclusion. These details, little known abroad, were evidence that even a small country could do something effective for the work of civilization and peace. Norway had already got recognition for what she had done. Alfred Nobel, Sweden's great son, had entrusted the Norwegian Storting with the annual awarding of a prize of about \$40,000 to the persons who had won distinction in the cause.

Mr. Lund expressed his great pleasure at being permitted to come to this Congress and declare his appreciation of the leading part which America had taken in promoting the cause of peace.

Hon. John Olsson, member of the Interparliamentary Union, and delegate of the Swedish Peace Society, spoke for Sweden. Never before, he thought, had a body of representatives from so many different nations received such honor and hospitality as the United States government had shown the interparliamentary delegates to St. Louis. The reception here at Boston, also, was splendid. The foreign delegates had seen and admired the big American cities, the vast prairies and cornfields, the Rocky Mountains; but they had admired much more the absence of soldiers. They had not seen soldiers in the streets, great armies of men taken from business and preparing for war, great fortresses on the frontier of a peaceable neighbor. The old saying, "If you wish peace, prepare for war," was not true. Big armies, he said, were the greatest menace to peace. A big army must have something to do. Nobody could doubt this. Europe was still enthralled with the error that big armies were a preparation for peace. This lie had for centuries cheated the old nations.

America had proved that in the struggle for peace, justice and humanity, it was not wise to depend upon great armies and fortresses. But in this noble struggle it was not always the greatest nations that led. Small nations could forward the progress of civilization. Sweden had given the world Alfred Nobel, the founder of so many institutions for the advancement of humanity and peace.

Mr. Olsson said he should never forget the historic moment when President Roosevelt promised the Interparliamentary delegates, in the most sympathetic and expressive words, that he would call upon the nations to join in another peace conference at The Hague. This promise marked one of the most important steps on the way to peace ever taken. The President had voiced, he believed, the sincere wish of all his fellow-citizens. He wished to express for his countrymen the deepest gratitude to President Roosevelt for that noble and important promise.

Prof. Pierre Clerget of Locle brought the greetings of the Swiss peace workers. Switzerland, he said, was playing a great part in the international peace movement. They now had about twenty-five peace societies. Many clergymen and teachers were members. Switzer-

land was the seat of the International Peace Bureau, of the Interparliamentary Bureau and of the Peace and War Museum founded by John de Bloch. Since the Congress at Rouen last year, the directors had enriched the Peace Department of the museum. On his last visit to the museum he found quotations upon the walls from Andrew Carnegie, Henry Richard and Elihu Burritt. The Burritt quotation was this:

"People may laugh at the plan of arbitration, but in my opinion the warlike plan is infinitely more ludicrous. The inequality of horses, a disparity in the power of wielding the sword, or the possession of high powers of strategy in a general, are circumstances which the merest child can understand, and they have no connection with justice or national honor."

Albert K. Smiley of Mohonk Lake, whose great work for arbitration through the Mohonk Conferences is everywhere known, was then called upon to respond for the United States. He was thankful for the opportunity to speak. He was delighted with the Congress. His heart was filled with gratitude that so many persons had come together to discuss the most important question before the world. The time, he was sure, was not far distant when all the nations would submit their disputes to the tribunal at The Hague. He expected that, at the Conference which President Roosevelt proposed to call, some scheme would be devised to have the tribunal made into one whose judges would have fixed salaries, and reside at The Hague. To such a court all the nations would be inclined to submit their disputes. He expected to live to see that thing accomplished. He said to the foreign delegates present that he would be delighted to see them at Mohonk. They would all get an invitation from him to come to his house at Mohonk Lake and spend three or four days at the Arbitration Conference in the early part of next June; and he wanted them to be sure to come.

The next speaker was Dr. Jean Loris Melikoff, of Armenia, whose speech was read in English by Mr. Adolphe Smith, the interpreter. Dr. Melikoff said, in substance, that the delegation sent from Armenia by the Supreme Patriarch to plead the cause of the Armenians, desired to be present at this Congress, to affirm their deep attachment to the principles of peace. The Armenian nation, from the time of the dissolution of the Roman Empire to our own time, in spite of many calamities, had always stood for culture and civilization in the Orient. This element of civilization, neighboring nations, enemies of progress, had tried systematically to exterminate. Perhaps at this very moment Armenia's tormentors, mocking the meeting here, were unscrupulously shedding innocent blood. He hoped that this Congress might be able to suggest a practical and efficacious solution of the Armenian question, following the resolutions of the last four Peace Congresses, and point out a way to put an end to a state of things which was a disgrace to humanity, and the disappearance of which would contribute to secure and confirm the peace of the world.

After the close of these responses the Secretary presented the Report of the Secretary of the International Peace Bureau at Berne for 1903-4, on the events of the year relating to peace and war. The Report is given in full elsewhere in this issue.

A vice-president was then chosen for each of the seventeen nations represented in the Congress. Albert K. Smiley was selected as the Vice-President of the United States.

Three Committees were then appointed to prepare the business of the Congress: A, on Current Questions; B, on International Law and Kindred Subjects; C, on Propaganda. As far as practicable one delegate from each of the countries represented was placed on each of these Committees.

The Secretary then presented a large number of letters, telegrams and cablegrams from individuals and organizations of different kinds in various parts of the United States and Europe, conveying greetings and good wishes to the Congress. Many of these came from religious organizations. One was from the Nobel Committee, Christiania, Norway, and another from Andrew Carnegie from Scotland. Among the most interesting was an address from Melbourne, signed by six hundred and thirty-four citizens of the Commonwealth of Australia, among whom were many men prominent in both public and private life.

The Chairman then called upon Dr. Edward Everett Hale, who presented the following message of greeting to the Episcopal National Convention being held in Boston:

"The Thirteenth International Peace Congress sends its greetings to the National Convention of the Episcopal Church in its assembly in Boston, confident of its interest in the great work which we have in hand. The members of that Convention are cordially invited to share in our assemblies. Thank God, we need not ask the August Convention of the servants and followers of the Prince of Peace for sympathy, assistance and encouragement in all our endeavors."

The resolution was unanimously adopted, and the Secretary instructed to forward a copy to the Chairman of the Episcopal Convention.

The meeting then adjourned.

#### ECONOMIC CLUB LUNCHEON.

At 1.15 o'clock a luncheon for the foreign delegates was given by the Economic Club of Boston in Chipman Hall, Tremont Temple. About one hundred and fifty persons were present at the tables, among them a number of prominent Boston business men. After the luncheon brief addresses were made by William H. Lincoln, President of the Club, Hon. Gavin Brown Clark of England, and George H. Perris, Secretary of the Cobden Club, London. These dwelt prominently on the economic aspects of the question of peace and war.

#### TUESDAY EVENING PUBLIC MEETINGS.

Two public meetings were held on Tuesday evening, one in Tremont Temple, presided over by Hon. Oscar S. Straus, United States member of the Hague Court, at which the work and influence of the Hague Court were considered; the other was a Christian Endeavor Peace Rally in Park Street Church, at which Dr. Francis E. Clark presided. More than two thousand persons were at the Tremont Temple meeting. At Park Street Church the crowd was so great that many were unable to gain entrance.

The address of Mr. Straus was a very able and illuminating one, and we are glad to give it to our readers in full in this issue.

[CONTINUED IN NEXT ISSUE.]